

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed after the filing of a notice of appeal but prior to filing an appeal brief, along with a petition for a one-month extension of time, to place the claims in condition for allowance as discussed and agreed upon during the in-person interview on January 19, 2005. The amendments to the claims do not raise grounds for not entering the claims. Rather, the amendments to the claims merely convert existing dependent claims 3 and 6 into independent claim forms, as well as add existing dependent claims to these independent claim forms.

Applicants and Applicants' representative wish to thank Primary Examiner Shahid Al Alam and Examiner Jean Fleurantin for the assistance extended during the personal interview held on January 19, 2005. In view of the discussion during the interview, the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-21, 23, 24, and 26-80 are pending, with claims 1, 20, and 43, 44, 62, and 80 being independent. Claims 3, 6, 22, and 25 are cancelled by this amendment without waiver or prejudice.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-39, 41, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey (5,987,446) in view of Sullivan (6,105,028). As agreed upon during the in-person interview, Applicants have amended the independent claims to incorporate the feature of dependent claim 3. Also, as agreed upon during the in-person interview, Applicants have added new independent claims 44, 62, and 80 that place dependent claim 6 in independent form for a method claim, a computer claim, and a system claim. As indicated on the interview summary sheet, the claims are in condition for allowance.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method for performing a search for both local electronic content and remote electronic content based on a single query that includes, among other features, receiving a single query that includes at least one search term. In response to the single query, the received search term is simultaneously compared automatically with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local personal computing device to derive a first result and

is compared with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Corey and Sullivan, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest searching indexed electronic content stored on a local device and searching electronic content stored on a remote device in response to a single query.

Corey describes using two different search techniques to retrieve items from the same common information item database 46. Corey does not describe searching both the content stored on a local device and the content stored on a remote device in response to a single query.

Sullivan does not remedy the failures of Corey. Sullivan describes a web browser that can access cached web pages when disconnected from a network without the user having to notify the browser that the computer is disconnected from the network. Sullivan does not describe anything related to performing a query using search terms and, thus, does not describe searching both the content stored on a local device and the content stored on a remote device in response to a single query.

For at least the reasons presented above, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Similarly to claim 1, amended claims 20 and 43 recite a computer program stored on a computer readable medium or a propagated signal (claim 20) and a system (claim 43) for simultaneously performing a search for both local electronic content and remote electronic content based on a single query. For at least the reasons presented above with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 and 43 and their dependent claims.

Claims 9 and 28, which depend from independent claims 1 and 20 respectively, were rejected separately in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey. Based on their dependency to claims 1 and 20 and for the reasons discussed above, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 28.

Claims 40 and 42, which depend indirectly from independent claims 1 and 20 respectively, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of

Sullivan and further in view of Yong Meng TEO. Yong Meng TEO does not remedy the failures of Corey and Sullivan described above and is not relied upon in the Office Action for that purpose. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 20, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 40 and 42.

New independent claims 44, 62, and 80 place dependent claim 6 in independent form and recite a method (claim 44), a computer program (claim 62) and a system (claim 80) for performing a search for both local electronic content and remote electronic content based on a single query that includes, among other features, receiving a single query that includes at least one search term. In response to the single query, the received search term is compared automatically with indexed electronic content to derive a first result and, at a separate time, is compared with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result, based on a single input action by a user. As discussed during the in-person interview, these claims also distinguish over Corey and Sullivan, either alone or in combination. Claims 45-61 and 63-79 depend from their respective independent claims and are allowable based at least on their respective dependency of the independent claims.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.


Applicant : Surendra Goel et al.
Serial No. : 09/917,675
Filed : July 31, 2001
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-194001 / Search 11

Enclosed is a \$2370 check of which \$2250 is for excess claims fees and \$120 is for the Petition of Extension of time fees. During the prosecution of this application, please apply any deficiencies, including any extension of time fees to maintain the pendency of the application, or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/25/2005



Joseph F. Key
Reg. No. 44,827

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331